

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERCustomer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,237
Docket No.: 9758-US-PA

SEP 10 2007

REMARKSPresent Status of the Application

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected. Specifically, claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by DE patent 202 11 121 U1). Moreover, claims 2-6, 8 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over DE patent 202 11 121 U1) in vie of Stout et al (US Patent No. 6,612,874). Reconsideration and allowance of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action RejectionsResponse to Claims Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by DE patent 202 11 121 U1).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. section 102, the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim.

Amended claim 1 now recites: "An interface apparatus with a rotational mechanism for connecting with an interface port in an electronic product, the interface apparatus comprising:

- a body comprising a memory module;
- a connector for connecting with an interface port; and
- a rotational mechanism for linking the body and the connector,

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,237
Docket No.: 9758-US-PA

wherein the rotational mechanism has at least one rotational joint having two to five degrees of freedom of movements, such that the rotational mechanism has two to five degrees of freedom of movements."

DE patent 202 11 121 U1) fails to disclose, teach or suggest the feature that "the rotational mechanism has at least one rotational joint having two to five degrees of freedom of movements, such that the rotational mechanism has two to five degrees of freedom of movements". Specifically, DE patent 202 11 121 U1) teaches a double interface compact flash memory including a frame and a USB interface unit. The frame contains a compact flash memory interface at one side and a socket at the other side. The USB interface unit is accommodated by the socket and is connected via a pivot. In particular, the USB interface unit only can be rotated in one dimension.

However, in the subject matter of amended claim 1, the rotational mechanism has at least one rotational joint having two to five degrees of freedom of movements, such that the rotational mechanism has two to five degrees of freedom of movements. That is, the subject matter of amended claim 1 can be rotated in multi-dimension. Therefore, the subject matter of amended claim 1 has features which are not disclosed by DE patent 202 11 121 U1).

Additionally, in DE patent 202 11 121 U1), the USB interface unit is rotated to be accommodated into the socket in order to satisfy the CF standards. However, in the application, the location of the body relative to the connector can be changed through the rotational mechanism of the interface apparatus for reducing impact damage. By the

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,237
Docket No.: 9758-US-PA

rotational mechanism, the body of the interface apparatus can be flipped to one side touching the edge of a notebook computer. Hence, the interface apparatus and the notebook computer can be slipped into a protective cover or a briefcase for ease of carriage. Moreover, with the rotational mechanism, the interface apparatus can be swiveled to untangle from neighboring connectors or cables. Therefore, the subject matter of amended claim 1 can provide many utilities which are not provided by DE patent 202 11 121 U1).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that DE patent 202 11 121 U1) does not teach each and every element in amended claim 1. Independent claim 1 patently define over the prior art reference, and should be allowed.

Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

Claims 2-6, 8, 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE patent 202 11 121 U1) in vie of Stout et al (US Patent No. 6,612,874).

As discussed in the above, amended independent claim should be patentable over DE patent 202 11 121 U1), and should be allowed.

Claims 2-4 depend on amended claim a, therefore, claims 2-4 should be also allowed.

Claims 5-6, 8 and 10-13 have been cancelled without prejudice, therefore, the rejection relating thereto is now moot.